

## I. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9-11, 26-30, 32-35, and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Sistanizadeh*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

An anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is overcome by a showing that the Applicant's claims include at least one feature that is not shown, described or taught in the cited prior art reference, explicitly or by inherency. *Sistanizadeh* does not teach or suggest all features of present Claim 1.

### A. CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites:

A method of assigning a network address to a host based on authentication for a physical connection between the host and an intermediate device, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:  
receiving, at a router hosting an authenticator process for the host, from a first server that provides authentication and authorization, in response to a request for authentication for the physical connection, first data indicating at least some of authentication and authorization information;  
**receiving, at a DHCP relay agent process of the router, from the host, a DHCP discovery message for discovering a logical network address for the host;**  
**generating at the DHCP relay agent process a second message that comprises the DHCP discovery message and the first data; and**  
**sending the second message from the DHCP relay agent process to a DHCP server that provides the logical network address for the host;**  
**wherein generating the second message further comprises sending a third message, from the authenticator process to the relay agent process, that contains at least some of the authentication and authorization information based on the first data.** (emphasis added)

The above-bolded features of Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by *Sistanizadeh*.

#### 1. *Sistanizadeh fails to teach or suggest the recited DHCP relay agent of Claim 1*

The Office Action cites col. 9, line 61 to col. 10, line 14 of *Sistanizadeh* for disclosing the step of "receiving, at a DHCP relay agent process of the router, from the host, a DHCP discovery message for discovering a logical network address for the host," as recited in Claim 1. This is

incorrect. That portion of *Sistanizadeh* merely states that a DHCP server receives an IP address request from a computer, authenticates the computer, and sends the computer an IP address. The only mention of a router comes after the DHCP server sends the IP address to the computer. The applicable portion of *Sistanizadeh* states: “The router receives a packet from a computer, routes the packet to the appropriate ISP based on its source IP address, i.e., the computer's IP address” (col. 10, lines 4-6). However, according to Claim 1, a router receives a DHCP discovery message.

Further, it is unclear what element in *Sistanizadeh* the Office Action is equating to the recited “DHCP relay agent process of the router.” In fact, *Sistanizadeh* fails to describe the use a DHCP relay agent at all. Instead, in *Sistanizadeh*, all DHCP communications occur directly between a DHCP server and a DHCP client without the use of a DHCP relay agent.

2. *Sistanizadeh fails to teach or suggest the recited second message of Claim 1*

The Office Action cites col. 12, line 31 to col. 13, line 56 of *Sistanizadeh* for disclosing the step of “generating at the DHCP relay agent process a second message that comprises the DHCP discovery message and the first data,” as recited in Claim 1. This is incorrect. That cited portion of *Sistanizadeh* fails to even mention routers, much less anything resembling a DHCP relay agent process of a router. Therefore, *Sistanizadeh* must fail to teach or suggest that a process on a router generates a message, much less a message that comprises a DHCP discovery message and authentication and authorization (AA) information, as recited in Claim 1.

Fundamentally, *Sistanizadeh* only discloses a router that routes packets and deletes information from packets. None of the routers in *Sistanizadeh* **generate** messages that comprise information from two different sources (i.e., the recited first server and the recited host).

3. *Sistanizadeh fails to teach or suggest the “hand off”*

The Office Action cites the same portion of *Sistanizadeh* cited previously for disclosing the step of “wherein generating the second message further comprises sending a third message, from the authenticator process to the relay agent process, that contains at least some of the authentication and authorization information based on the first data,” as recited in Claim 1. This is incorrect. Claim 1 involves an authenticator process, hosted by a router, providing or “handing off” authentication and authorization information to the recited DHCP relay agent process. *Sistanizadeh* lacks any teaching or suggestion of the claimed step or any form of a “hand off” of AA information (e.g., element 236 in FIG. 2 in the present application) from a first router process (e.g., authenticator 105 of FIGs. 1 and 2 in the present application) to a second router process (e.g., DHCP relay agent 103 of FIGs. 1 and 2 in the present application), after which the second process generates a message that comprises the AA information and a DHCP discovery message. One benefit of this approach is that the “hand off” relieves the DHCP server from having to re-authenticate the user as a condition for assigning an address. There are no similar router processes disclosed in *Sistanizadeh*.

Based on the foregoing, *Sistanizadeh* fails to teach or suggest all the features of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over *Sistanizadeh*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is therefore respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 26-28

Each of the features discussed above for Claim 1 is present in independent Claims 26-28. Therefore, Claims 26-28 are patentable for at least those reasons that Claim 1 is patentable as set forth above.

C. CLAIMS 3-8, 10-11, AND 29-38

Each of the features discussed above for Claim 1 is present, by dependency, in Claims 3-8, 10-11, and 29-38. Because each of the dependant claims includes the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable.

**II. CONCLUSIONS & MISCELLANEOUS**

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firm check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: October 2, 2007

/DanielDLedesma#57181/

Daniel D. Ledesma

Reg. No. 57,181

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1093  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1229  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076